

ACADEMIC SENATE - MINUTES  
April 10, 1973

I. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Barton Olsen in the Faculty/Staff Dining Room at 3:17 p.m.

II. Those in attendance were:

MEMBERS:

Alberti, Robert	Mott, John	Voss, Larry
Bailey, Roger	Murphy, Paul	Wills, Max
Boone, Joseph	Neel, Paul	
Brady, Mary	Nelson, Linden	<u>Ex-Officio</u>
Burroughs, Sarah	Olsen, Barton	(Voting)
Burton, Robert	Peterson, James	
Cirovic, Michael	Quinlan, Charles	Anderson, Roy
Clerkin, Edward	Rickard, Herman	Andreini, Robert
Coyes, Frank	Rhoads, Howard	Fisher, Clyde
Fierstine, Harry	Roberts, Alice	Gibson, J. Cordner
Frost, Robert	Rogalla, John	Valpey, Robert
Greffenius, R. J.	Rosen, Art	Grant, Dave
Harden, Sheldon	Scheffer, Paul	
Hooks, Robert	Sorenson, Robert	<u>Ex-Officio</u>
Johnson, Corwin	Smith, Howard	(Non-Voting)
Labhard, Lezlie	Smith, Murray	
Lowry, John	Thomas, Guy	Andrews, Dale W.

III. Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting of March 13, 1973 were approved as submitted.

IV. Chairman Olsen introduced Dr. Charles Adams, Chairman of the Statewide Academic Senate, CSUC. Dr. Adams spoke and answered questions relative to faculty issues in the CSUC system. A summary of his remarks is attached to these minutes ("Attachment A").

V. Vice Chairman Arthur Rosen conducted the Academic Senate business meeting.

1. The Senate Elections Committee report was distributed by committee chairman Murray Smith. Dr. Rosen called for additional nominations from the floor. There were none. The list of nominees is attached to these minutes ("Attachment B").

2. Information Items

a) }  
b) } (SEE AGENDA 4/10/73 - Information Items)  
c) }

d) Item IV-3 from agenda: Curriculum Committee report attached to agenda.

e) Item IV-6 from agenda: Howard Rhoads moved, seconded by Corwin Johnson, to make this a business item. The motion was carried. (See Item IV-3-a).

### 3. Business Items

- a) Howard Rhoads moved, seconded by Corwin Johnson: that the Academic Senate CPSU adopt the alternative proposal ("Attachment C-2") and submit it to the CPSU faculty as representing this Senate's position on the Statewide Academic Senate "Salary Schedule Referendum." Following considerable discussion, it was moved, seconded, and carried to amend the main motion to read: that the Academic Senate CPSU adopt the alternative "Salary Schedule Referendum" and submit it to the CPSU faculty simultaneously with the Statewide Academic Senate "Salary Schedule Referendum." The results of both surveys are to be forwarded to the Statewide Academic Senate together with our opinion that the Referendum statement proposed by the Statewide Senate is inadequate in both form and substance. ("Attachment C-1"). The amendment carried.

The amended main motion carried.

- b) Frank Coyes moved, seconded by John Lowry, that: the Academic Senate CPSU adopt the "Guidelines for Evaluation of Department Heads" ("Attachment D"). After discussion, the proposed document was modified slightly to clarify the definition of "Department Heads." The previous question was moved, seconded, and carried, ending debate.

The main motion carried 25-10.

- c) Harry Fierstine moved, seconded by Ed Clerkin, that: the Academic Senate CPSU adopt the "Statement of Educational Quality" (Attachment "E"), and forward it to the President, the CSUC Trustees, and the CSUC Academic Senate. Following discussion, Roy Anderson moved, seconded by David Saveker, that: the proposal of the Instruction Committee be referred back to the Committee as incomplete.

The motion to refer carried.

Acting Chairman Rosen requested that the Instruction Committee present a revised proposal at the May meeting of the Academic Senate.

### 4. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

The next Executive Meeting is Tuesday, May 1, and the next regular meeting is Tuesday, May 8.

## "ATTACHMENT A"

Summary of comments before the Academic Senate CPSU, April 10, 1973, by Dr. Charles Adams, Chairman, Academic Senate of the California State University and Colleges.

### Structure and Operations of the Statewide Academic Senate

- .There are 50 members (plus the Chancellor) in the Academic Senate, CSUC.
- .Campuses elect 2, 3, or 4 senators, depending upon FTE enrollment.
- .The State of California budgeted \$167,000 in 1972-73 for the Senate. It is hoped that \$237,000 will be available in 1973-74. Funds are expended for: released time for the Chairman; 1/2 released time for Chairmen of standing committees and members of the executive committee; travel expenses; office staff at CSUC headquarters.
- .The Senate holds regular meetings for 2 days several times a year, and key members of the Senate meet regularly with the CSUC Board of Trustees, and committees of the Board.
- .A particularly important expansion of Senate influence over the last four years has been in "behind-the-scenes" influence of Trustees in committees and individually.
- .The Senate appoints faculty members to a number of systemwide committees, some 60 CSUC faculty members hold such appointments this year.
- .The Senate now presents "briefs" to the Trustees with data and recommendations supplementary to the staff reports which appear in the Trustees' agenda.
- .The Senate maintains active communication with the University of California Academic Senate.

### Issues of Concern to the Academic Senate and the Faculties

- .The CSUC System suffers from a lack of clear definition of roles (Presidents, Chancellor's Staff, Academic Senates, Student Governments).
- .Administrators are given disproportionate representation in policy making (e.g. the Chancellor's Office plus the Council of Presidents both represented, on a committee, with only one faculty representative).
- .The Statewide Senate (and local senates) often "meddle and peddle":
  - we meddle in others' business (e.g. student issues);
  - we peddle our influence.
- .The Chancellor's staff attempts to influence the Board of Trustees inappropriately in preparing the Trustees' meeting agenda.
- .Salary issues:
  - .The concept of "comparison institutions" is a charade manipulated to fit a predetermined figure.
  - .Collective negotiation is "inevitable and necessary," however faculty organizations must work cooperatively for the mutual benefit of the

faculties, not competitively.

.Salary schedules, when developed cooperatively (e.g. with Senate involvement must be met or renegotiated in the same manner as initially derived.

.The "Salary Schedule Referendum" will be conducted by the Senate in late April or early May.

.The Chancellor's "moonlighting" proposal is in limbo.

.The Statewide Senate will review the classification of Librarians.

.Questions regarding the definition of "full funding," the faculty allocation formula, and the elimination of Class I and Class II are all pending further study of the Salary Schedule.

NOMINATIONS FOR:

Academic Senate Officers

Chairman: Sheldon Hard~~on~~  
Robert Alberti

---

Vice Chairman: Robert Burton  
Alice Roberts

---

Secretary: Harry Scales

---

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

Architecture David Saveker

Agriculture John Rogalla

Communicative Arts Roger Bailey

Human Deveopment Lezlie Labhard

Business and  
Social Sciences Walter Rice

Engineering Paul Scheffer

Science and  
Mathematics Arthur Rosen

Professional  
Consultative  
Services Marcus Gold

ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

---

AS-546-73/Flr  
Exec. Comm. Subst.  
Jan. 11-12, 1973

Salary Schedule Referendum

- WHEREAS,** The events that have transpired since the adoption of the "new (1970) salary structure" in the Spring of 1970 suggests that the legislature is unwilling to fully fund it, and
- WHEREAS,** Many faculty who originally favored the salary structure proposal now have serious reservations in view of the events that have transpired, especially the events since July 1972, and
- WHEREAS,** Some change in the salary structure from the existing structure appears both necessary and desirable; now, therefore, be it
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges by means of a referendum submit the following questions to the entire faculty of the system between April 23, 1973 and May 5, 1973:
- RESOLVE**
1. The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure contingent upon full funding\* for its implementation:  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
  2. The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure and desires that it be implemented as soon as possible even if funding for full implementation\* is not available or assured.  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
  3. The CSUC faculty prefers to continue with the present salary structure.  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
  4. The CSUC faculty requests that an appropriate committee be established to formulate a new salary structure (i.e., different from the existing structure and the 1970 salary structure) for the system and that until such time as a new salary structure is developed and adopted, the present salary structure remain in effect.  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

\* Full funding and full implementation are interpreted to mean that sufficient funds will be provided for a rate of progression that is consistent with the average waiting periods specified in the 1970 salary structure.

ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

---

AS-546-73/F1r  
Exec. Comm. Subst.  
Jan. 11-12, 1973

Salary Schedule Referendum

- WHEREAS, The events that have transpired since the adoption of the "new (1970) salary structure" in the Spring of 1970 suggests that the legislature is unwilling to fully fund it, and
- WHEREAS, Many faculty who originally favored the salary structure proposal now have serious reservations in view of the events that have transpired, especially the events since July 1972, and
- WHEREAS, Some change in the salary structure from the existing structure appears both necessary and desirable; now, therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges by means of a referendum submit the following questions to the entire faculty of the system between April 23, 1973 and May 5, 1973:
- (1) The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure contingent upon full funding\* for its implementation.
  - (2) The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure contingent upon full funding\* and the elimination of the additional "intensive review" procedure proposed by the Chancellor.
  - (3) The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure and desires that it be implemented as soon as possible even if funding for full implementation\* is not available or assured.
  - (4) The CSUC faculty supports the continuance of the present salary structure contingent upon elimination of the 60/40 limitation on promotion.
  - (5) The CSUC faculty prefers to continue with the present salary structure.

- (6) The CSUC faculty requests that an appropriate committee be established to formulate a new salary structure (i.e., different from the existing structure and the 1970 salary structure) for the system and that until such time as a new salary structure is developed and adopted, the present salary structure remain in effect.

**Note:** In balloting, faculty are requested to rank order their preference for each of the above choices.

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_

\* Full funding and full implementation are interpreted to mean that sufficient funds will be provided for a rate of progression that is consistent with the average waiting periods specified in the 1970 salary structure.



GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION  
OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

- I. Faculty evaluation of department ~~or division~~ heads at California Polytechnic State University is designed, as part of the established departmental personnel procedures, to be one means of assisting those individuals in achieving a high level of administrative effectiveness and productive working relationships with faculty, staff, and students.
- II. Evaluation instruments developed for this purpose should provide means for assessing working relationships, leadership qualities, academic excellence, willingness and ability to communicate, and the maintenance of rapport with others on campus and in the community.
- III. Department ~~or division~~ heads at California Polytechnic State University shall be evaluated by their respective academic, academic-related, and other professional employees once each year by May 1.
- IV. All academic, academic-related, and other professional employees who have been employed in their respective departments for at least one year shall be eligible to participate in the evaluation if they so choose.
- V. For purposes of these procedures:
  1. "Department ~~or Division~~ Heads" shall include all heads of Instructional Departments ~~and Divisions~~ and any other Directors who supervise employees eligible to vote in the election of Academic Senators.
  2. "Academic, academic-related, and other professional employees" shall include all University employees who teach and all academic-related and professional employees who are eligible to vote in the election of Academic Senators.
- VI. To initiate this procedure, each department ~~or division~~ shall develop guidelines and criteria for such evaluation. All those who are eligible to evaluate the department ~~or division~~ head are eligible to serve on a committee which shall be established for this purpose. The committee shall forward a copy of its recommended procedures to the School Dean and the department head for their suggestions and recommendations prior to adoption.
- VII. During the implementation phase of the evaluation process in 1973-74, the evaluations, which may be anonymous, shall be presented to the department ~~or division~~ heads or directors for their information. In subsequent academic years, the evaluations shall be presented to the department ~~or division~~ heads or directors in a manner consistent with the established departmental ~~or division~~ procedures, and they shall also be submitted to the Dean of the respective school. ~~or division~~.

"Attachment E"

We, the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, are concerned that the cost of education has been the primary consideration within the State University and Colleges System to the detriment of the quality of education. Specifically, considerable improvement in quality could be developed in the area of Faculty-Student, Faculty-Faculty, and Faculty-Profession inter-relationships. Present staffing provisions provide only minimum levels of time for contact with each student. The faculty needs to devote more time to:

Interaction with and attention to individual students.

Free exchange of ideas with students and other faculty members.

Preparation of current course material.

Innovation and improvement of teaching techniques.

Evaluation of student performance.

Professional development in order to remain current with rapidly advancing knowledge.

We believe the present assumption that a faculty member only needs two hours of outside class time for each hour in class to achieve the above goals is inadequate; the above listed improvements cannot be fully implemented within such a time scale. In our experience, if any of the above listed needs are to be pursued with vigor, at least three hours of outside class time for every hour in class are a much more realistic standard. We propose that four hours of time for each hour of class contact be accepted as <sup>4</sup>/<sub>5</sub> work load unit<sup>s</sup> (= 1 hour in class plus 3 hours outside of class), and that the standard work load be constituted of <sup>36</sup>/<sub>5</sub> such work load units, plus <sup>4</sup>/<sub>5</sub> work load unit<sup>s</sup> for related activities. \*

We believe such a change in work load standards would result in improved educational quality in the California State University and Colleges System.

\* It is assumed that comparable equivalencies will be developed for lab schedules, activity courses, supervision of student projects, etc.

ACADEMIC SENATE  
California Polytechnic State University  
San Luis Obispo

April 10, 1973

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM

- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CPSU has a continuing concern in the implementation and development of the B. A. degree in Liberal Studies to meet the requirements of the Ryan Bill; and
- WHEREAS, There will be occasion to review the policies and curriculum as the program is implemented and projected for the years 1975-77; and
- WHEREAS, The nature of the curriculum (essentially inter-disciplinary or multi-subject and including basic courses beyond General Education in many departments and a number of schools) creates special university-wide concerns; therefore be it
- RESOLVED That the Academic Senate CPSU recommends to the President that an advisory committee be formed, including at least one representative of the Academic Senate, to work with the Chairman of the Department of Liberal Studies and the Dean of the School of Human Development and Education; and be it further
- RESOLVED That the Senate representative on the Advisory Committee shall make periodic reports to the Senate on the status of the Liberal Studies degree program; and be it further
- RESOLVED That the members of the Advisory Committee shall have terms of at least two or three years and that the terms shall be overlapping.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA

- WHEREAS The Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University has become an increasingly effective voice for the faculty in University governance; and
- WHEREAS Members of the faculty spend a great deal of time and effort in carrying out the business of the Academic Senate; and
- WHEREAS The granting of one-half released time to the Chairman of the Academic Senate provided a measurable increase in the effectiveness of Senate operations; and
- WHEREAS The business of the Academic Senate is conducted in a large part through extensive paperwork, including agendas and minutes of the Senate and its major committees, committee reports, recommendations to the President of the University, the Statewide Academic Senate, the Chancellor and Trustees of the CSUC system, routine internal memoranda and letters to off-campus individuals and agencies, all of which require clerical assistance in preparation; and
- WHEREAS It is inappropriate and unfair to place the burden of the Academic Senate clerical workload on clerical staff in the various departments with which Senate officers are affiliated; and
- WHEREAS The Academic Senate Office, Tenaya Hall 103, can be an effective communications center for the Senate only if it is staffed regularly; and
- WHEREAS Senate officers change periodically (annually at the present time), while continuity of Senate operations is important; and
- WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University is, as far as is known, the only member institution in the CSUC system which does not assign a regular clerical position to the Academic Senate;
- THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That the Academic Senate, California Polytechnic State University petition the President of the University to assign a 0.5 clerical position at the level Clerical Assistant III-A to the Academic Senate, effective July 1, 1973; and
- BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, CPSU be authorized to recruit and select a person to fill the position thus assigned, provided only that such person not be simultaneously employed by any other department or unit of the University.